

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated November 18, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

The Examiner objects to the title of the invention. Applicant has amended the title to be more descriptive, and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

The Examiner objects to the drawings for including reference numbers 25, 74, and 88 not mentioned in the description. Applicant overcomes this objection by amending the specification at paragraphs [0020] and [0060] to include the reference numbers 25 and 74, respectively. No new matter has been added. In addition, Applicant notes that reference number 88 was mention in the specification as filed at paragraph [0066].

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,655,825 to Muthu et al. Claims 4, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu in view of U.S. Patent 5,252,733 to Norman et al. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,361,180 to Iimura in view of Muthu. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Iimura in view of Muthu and further in view of Norman.

Applicant cancels claims 1-8. The rejection of claims 9-12 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 9-12 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "first and second light sources at both sides of the light-guiding plate to emit light; [and] optical fiber surrounding the circumference of the first and second light sources, to concentrate and to emit the light emitted from the first and second light sources". None of the cited references including Muthu, Norman,

and Iimura, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The structure of claim 9 of the present invention is different from the Muthu structure in that Muthu discloses "For optimum efficiency of light transmission, it is contemplated that the monochromatic light coupling fibers 30 each have an output end oriented perpendicularly to the first end 16 of the color mixing optical fiber 14. In a preferred embodiment, the input ends are bonded directly to the first end 16 of the color mixing optical fiber 14 with an optical adhesive having an index of refraction matching the monochromatic and color mixing optical fibers 30, 14." However Muthu does not disclose or suggest "first and second light sources at both sides of the light-guiding plate to emit light;" or "optical fiber surrounding the circumference of the first and second light sources, to concentrate and to emit the light emitted from the first and second light sources" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner does not allege that Norman or Iimura disclose, teach, or suggest these features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 and claims 10-12, which depend from claim 9, are allowable over the cited references at least for this reason.

The rejection of claims 13-15 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 13-15 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a sub light-guiding plate at one side of the main light-guiding plate;

a light source at one side of the sub light-guiding plate to emit light;

first optical fiber surrounding the circumference of the light source, so as to concentrate and to emit the light emitted from the light source to an incident surface of the sub light-guiding plate;...[and] a second optical fiber surrounding an emitting surface of the sub light-guiding plate and an incident surface of the main light-guiding plate, so as to concentrate and emit the light emitted from the sub light-guiding plate to the incident surface

of the main light-guiding plate”. None of the cited references including Muthu, Norman, and Imura, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The structure of claim 13 of the present invention is different from the Muthu structure in that Muthu discloses “For optimum efficiency of light transmission, it is contemplated that the monochromatic light coupling fibers 30 each have an output end oriented perpendicularly to the first end 16 of the color mixing optical fiber 14. In a preferred embodiment, the input ends are bonded directly to the first end 16 of the color mixing optical fiber 14 with an optical adhesive having an index of refraction matching the monochromatic and color mixing optical fibers 30, 14.”

However Muthu does not disclose or suggest “first optical fiber surrounding the circumference of the light source, so as to concentrate and to emit the light emitted from the light source to an incident surface of the sub light-guiding plate;...[and] a second optical fiber surrounding an emitting surface of the sub light-guiding plate and an incident surface of the main light-guiding plate, so as to concentrate and emit the light emitted from the sub light-guiding plate to the incident surface of the main light-guiding plate” as recited in claim 13.

By way of another example, Imura describes “In FIG. 2 and FIG. 4, when the linear lamp 200 lights up (i.e. is lit) on the linear lamp 200 emits light in its front direction and also its rear direction. The light emitting in the rear direction at the reflector 210 is redirected to the front side by the reflector 210.” Because the lamp 200 directly illuminates light-guiding plates 110 and 120, it cannot disclose, teach or suggest the first and second optical fibers as recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 and claims 14 and 15, which depend from claim 13, are allowable over the cited references at least for this reason.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and arguments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
George C. Ballas

Registration No.: 52,587  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicant